

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

HUBERT SEATON §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:17cv35  
TEXAS LEGISLATURE, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
AND DENYING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Hubert Seaton, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

After the lawsuit was dismissed, Seaton filed a motion for reconsideration, which the Magistrate Judge properly construed as a motion for relief from judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). *See Evans v. Williams*, 372 F.App'x 543, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 7295, 2010 WL 1404297 (5th Cir., April 8, 2010). The Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the motion for relief from judgment be denied. Seaton received a copy of this Report on February 1, 2019, but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See*

*United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law"). It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. 13) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment (docket no. 12) is **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** March 11, 2019.



---

Ron Clark, Senior District Judge